

tion this becomes his property; that a prescription is simply a letter to the druggist. At any rate it would seem to us that it behooves the doctor to warn the patient as to the dangers he incurs in leaving these letters in unscrupulous hands.

Such acts as these are bound to bring medical men to consider the advisability of officially endorsing drug stores which are ethical and to black-list those that are not.

### ETHICAL PROPRIETARY AND "PATENT MEDICINE," ALL IN ONE.

The favorite way—because the most economical—of introducing a nostrum to the public, is first to exploit it to the medical profession. This was the plan used abroad in introducing "Sirolin," the orange-flower flavored syrup of potassium guaiacol sulphonate, the essential constituent of which, the potassium guaiacol sulphonate, had first been popularized to the medical profession under the name "Thiocol."

In this country also the substance itself, Thiocol, was first exploited to the medical profession and as a strictly ethical preparation was admitted to New and Nonofficial Remedies some years ago. More recently Thiocol was introduced in the form of a syrup, Syrup Thiocol, Roche, and this also in due time was admitted to New and Nonofficial Remedies. Following the European plan Thiocol is now being put out in this country in the form of Sirolin by the "Sirolin Company." While under the latter title it is also being circularized to physicians, it is plainly intended for the public, for an advertisement taken from the New York Evening World reads:

"It is wonderfully useful in treating consumption. It absolutely prevents the occurrence of it."

"Your physician knows Sirolin."

"Sirolin is a physician's remedy—not a patent nostrum."

Holding that the exploitation of Thiocol is a public menace, the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry has announced, very properly (*Jour. A. M. A.*, June 21, 1913, p. 1974), that the acceptance of Thiocol and Syrup Thiocol, Roche has been withdrawn and that these articles will not be described in future editions of New and Nonofficial Remedies.

As Thiocol after having been introduced to the medical profession was then put out in the form of a syrup, so the opium preparation, Pantopon, also manufactured by Hoffmann-LaRoche, after having been liberally advertised for a number of years, is now being offered in the form of a syrup of Pantopon. Inasmuch as the Thiocol syrup is now being advertised to the public we are wondering if this firm will follow a similar course with its Pantopon syrup. According to a German advertisement "Pantopon-Syrup, Roche" has the advantage that it may readily be given to children and thus it would find little difficulty in qualifying as a "baby-killer."

### THE NEW LAW.

Some of the critics of the strictures which the JOURNAL passed upon the legislature for enacting the abortion which has become the new medical law of this state—or will become the law on August 11th, 1913, have asked many questions about the law and have asked how the JOURNAL can help to make the best out of it. That last is a pretty hard question. If the governor sees fit to appoint good men, they can do much good; the goodness or badness of the law rests largely with the men who are to administer it. But it is all absolutely new and how it is to be construed no one can say until its various provisions have been passed upon by the courts. The old law was not perfect but it had the advantage in this, that all of its provisions except the one relating to Army and Navy men, had been passed upon by the courts and we knew exactly where we stood. The new law provides for license without examination of any one who has a license obtained on examination in some other state, upon complying with the rules which the board shall make; but the rules cannot be made until the new board is appointed and has got to work. The law does not provide for reciprocity; the word does not appear in the act. It also provides for a special examination for all those who were licensed in other states prior to 1901, but apparently it is so drawn as to exclude absolutely every physician who had less than a four-year course, no matter when he graduated. This would exclude nearly every graduate prior to 1891 and a very large number of those graduating between 1891 and 1906. This point is, however, uncertain and must remain so until the courts have passed upon it. There is mighty little "helping" that we can do except to help build up our societies and improve the character of the members so that membership will become a sort of "hall mark" in the eyes of the public; strive to make membership in a county society take the place of a license, in the public mind.

### SHALL WE BE SILENT?

Two members of the Society have written to the editor expressing disapproval of the editorial notes in the JOURNAL which were in the nature of criticism of the intelligence or the sanity of the last legislature. Is it the desire of the members of the Society that its JOURNAL shall be a spineless thing? Shall we keep silent when we see wrong things being done or shall we go on record as not approving them? Shall we tell the truth about things even though it may hurt somebody's feelings, or shall we just go shilly-shallying along and say nothing but general platitudes? Who wanted a new medical law? What elements were back of it? (a) The Governor, because he's playing cheap politics and has been from the start and because he's playing with the horde of fanatics that infest the South; (b) the aforesaid horde of fanatics who think that every one should be permitted to practice medicine; (c) those regulars and others who are connected with medical schools that do not

want a decently high standard or do not want to teach as they should; (d) a large number of medical men who could not pass a fair examination and wanted some way in which they could slide into California by a side door. These are the elements that fought for a new medical law—and got it, just as I said last year that they would get it in spite of everything that we could do in the way of common sense educational effort to the contrary; the wave of fanaticism, of unrest, is so strong that reason can not oppose it; it will have to take its course and eventually die down. Thinking men in all walks of life see this condition of unrest and are studying it most interestedly. Much harm will be done and, of course, some good will be done. Every law that was made by the last legislature is not bad—but most of them are! No one could argue with those fool legislators; the really able ones were playing the usual game of petty politics and log rolling and using the fanatics to their entire satisfaction. Why should we avoid telling the truth about it? The noble legislators abolished a standard that the Supreme Court of this State has said was a wise one; was that good? They were instructed to pass a "reciprocity amendment" and the word "reciprocate" does not appear in the new law! Any one in any other state may come here under certain conditions, but there is nothing to compel or secure similar treatment from that other state! Is that wise, is that good? Is it worth while being polite to crazy men or fools on the assumption that they may get over being crazy or foolish? Shall we, as the organized representatives of a learned profession, supposedly composed of intelligent men, sit quietly by and see fanatics and worse doing harm, passing bad bills and making crazy laws, and say nothing? What are we here for? If we say nothing may it not be fairly assumed that we are lacking in sufficient intelligence to see that a wrong thing has been done? There are some good things in the new law; there had to be; but they are buried deep in the mess of bad and fool things in it and it will take years of litigation to find out if some of the supposedly good things are constitutional! We, as a profession and as a Society, are not afraid of other things; why should we begin to be afraid of telling a little truth?

#### PAID LOBBY REJECTED!

One of the most important actions of the House of Delegates was the rejection of the Murphy-Evans idea of maintaining a paid lobby in Washington to promote public health legislation and particularly an Owen bill; one cannot say *the* Owen bill because there have been such a variety of Owen bills and there is every reason to believe that there will be more. Nothing that has happened to the Association in some years has hurt it so much, in the eyes of the public, as the activity of a former representative of the Association in Washington in the winter of 1909-10, in endeavoring to influence legislation in favor of the then

Owen bill. It was a lobby and was classed by all laymen in the same class with any other lobby and the general impression was that there must be "something in it" for the Association if they were willing to spend this money to keep a lobby in Washington. This action of the House of Delegates absolutely endorses the policy of the Board of Trustees which was formulated in 1910 when a resolution was introduced instructing our representative to leave Washington; the resolution failed of passage by one vote, but the policy was adopted and the wisdom of it has now been made clear. The whole thing is buried in the minutes of the meeting, but in brief it may be stated as follows: Murphy as Chairman and Evans as Secretary of a Committee on National Health Legislation (a committee that had been abolished by the House of Delegates but was kept alive through a trick) presented an alleged "report" of the committee of nine; the "report" was signed by only four of the nine and only two of these four actually signed their own names to it, the other two being initialed "W. A. E." This "report" demanded the keeping of a lobby in Washington, abused the Trustees unmercifully for not appropriating money during the past two years for that purpose, and generally attacked the Board for its policy of education rather than lobbying. The allegations in the "report" were carefully considered by a reference committee and the report of the reference committee, which report endorsed the policy of the Trustees, deplored the lobby idea and recommended that the Murphy-Evans committee be discharged, was adopted practically unanimously; there were but two or three dissenting votes that could be heard.

#### THE COLLEGE.

The JOURNAL has been asked by a number of our readers to give some serious information in regard to the proposed "College of Surgeons" and the method of its forming. It grew out of the clinical congress of surgery held in New York last year. These clinical congresses were started by Dr. Martin, editor of *Surgery, Gynecology and Obstetrics* and a large number of doctors attended them, as clinics are always attractive and some of the most prominent surgeons in the country participated. The idea of forming a "college of surgeons" was sprung at the New York congress and met with the approval of the mob of those in attendance. It is said that a corporation was then formed, of which Murphy and Martin were two of the five directors, and the proposed name was thus legalized. The scheme was talked over all over the country quite naturally and a meeting was called to take place in Washington in May. It was generally supposed that this meeting was for the purpose of discussing the scheme and determining whether or not it was good and practicable, but the discussion part of it was quite an unnecessary idea; it had all been carefully arranged before hand. Dr. Ed. Martin took the chair, at the Washington meeting, and Dr. Franklin Martin was made secretary. Dr. Montgomery